

**KENTUCKY BOARD OF EDUCATION
REGULAR MEETING
NOVEMBER 3, 2004**

**STATE BOARD ROOM
1ST FLOOR, CAPITAL PLAZA TOWER
FRANKFORT, KENTUCKY**

SUMMARY MINUTES

The Kentucky Board of Education held a regular meeting on November 3, 2004, in the State Board Room, First Floor, Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky. The Board conducted the following discussions:

Wednesday, November 3, 2004

The Kentucky Board of Education met on November 3, 2004, and conducted the following business:

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Keith Travis called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Present for the meeting were Janice Allen, Dorie Combs, Bonnie Lash Freeman, Jeff Mando, Helen Mountjoy, Hilma Prather, David Rhodes, David Tachau, Keith Travis, Janna Vice and David Webb. Absent from the meeting was Tom Layzell.

***INPUT FROM THE NATIONAL TECHNICAL ADVISORY PANEL ON
ASSESSMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY (NTAPAA) ON WRITING ASSESSMENT
ISSUES***

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated that the Board had set this time aside to discuss writing assessment issues but reminded members it was not time to make a final decision on the writing assessment. He stated that this topic would come back to the December meeting and in February, if needed. He continued that the Writing Focus Group did have another meeting but reported they are not in agreement. Wilhoit indicated that the Focus Group generated various options for the writing assessment with some points of agreement. The Commissioner then emphasized that as far as input from the National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA), there was not a date between now and the Board's next meeting to get their full input. He reported that only Dr. John Poggio was able to participate in the conference call that discussed writing assessment issues with Department staff.

The Commissioner went on to review that NTAPAA serves as technical advisors to the Board and listed the members of NTAPAA as follows: Andy Porter, Vanderbilt; James Catterall, Chair, of UCLA; Dr. John Poggio, Vice Chair, of the University of Kansas; Suzanne Lane, University of Pittsburg; Robert Linn, University of Colorado; and David Miller, University of Florida.

Helen Mountjoy added that it is important to remember NTAPAA is not the Board's creation; it is the creation of the legislature. She noted that there is a new procedure to access their advice, which does not allow the Board to reach them on short notice. Mountjoy also emphasized that NTAPAA does not always reach total agreement among its members. Commissioner Wilhoit added that the group is also cautious about making policy decisions. He noted that they give the impact of a policy decision, but leave the decision to the State Board. The Commissioner went on to say that if the Board wants advice from NTAPAA, the new process will require at least one month for this to occur. He suggested that in the future NTAPAA meetings be scheduled at the same time as state board meetings, if that can be arranged.

At this point the Board reviewed the summary of Dr. John Poggio's comments on writing assessment issues from the October 11, 2004, conference call. Concerns raised during this discussion included:

- The need for a clear read from the full NTAPAA on analytical versus holistic scoring.
- Whether a scoring system could combine holistic and analytical scoring.
- Whether we may want to do away with the word 'portfolio' and introduce a new term.
- Whether changing the scoring, professional development and weightedness would improve the writing assessment process and fix the perceived problems.
- What type of scoring methods will be used in the SAT and ACT writing components.
- Whether an analytical scoring method would equal or exceed the reliability and validity of the current holistic scoring method.

INPUT FROM THE WRITING FOCUS GROUP'S OCTOBER 20 MEETING

Associate Commissioner Starr Lewis, Nancy LaCount and Cherry Boyles came forward to answer questions about the input from the Writing Focus Group. A summary of the input was found in Attachment A to the staff note titled "Review of Kentucky's Writing Assessment". The areas summarized included:

- Consider alternate years for on-demand writing in the portfolio.

- Expand the performance levels for writing to more consistently align with other content areas and give credit for student progress within a performance level.
- Create new standards for writing to align with the new design of the writing assessment and to address the concern regarding the middle school standards and distinguished standards.
- Reallocate weight for on-demand and the portfolio, and factor in a small weight for multiple-choice.
- For on-demand writing, include response to text aligned with content areas as a choice.
- Provide more prompts and more choice for students. Provide more variety in purpose, audience and form.
- Provide choices at the high school level that help students enter into the prompt based on interest.
- Include workplace writing such as writing memos/proposals for an authentic purpose.
- In the directions to students consider including a reminder to create a purpose and audience for their response.
- Maintain a working writing portfolio that includes writing across genres and for authentic purposes, including workplace writing at the high school level.
- Broaden the categories for portfolio entries to be more inclusive and to increase student choice on purpose, audience and form.
- Make the letter to the reviewer in the portfolio a student choice rather than a requirement.

Concerns expressed by Board members were as follows:

- There must be purposeful items in the core content so students have the opportunity to reflect.
- The reflection must be for a specific purpose. The reflection should be tied to real world applications for Juniors and Seniors.
- Alternating years for on-demand and the portfolio seem to interrupt the continuous nature of writing. The Board needs to look at what the goals are in the writing assessment in order to have students write well.

- New benchmarks may have to be established that would require more professional development.
- Expanding the performance levels might inflate the results.
- NTAPAA needs to weigh-in on whether two portfolio pieces are adequate.
- NTAPAA needs to weigh-in on what the Board's criteria are for the writing assessment.
- Writing needs to measure real things that will measure writing skills rather than evaluating another discipline.

Next, the Board went on to look at the different models for writing assessment that were included as Attachment B, C, D and E to the staff note. Cherry Boyles went through each of the models with Board members. The consensus of the Board was that by the December meeting, staff needs to bring forward its soundest recommendation on what model to follow for the writing assessment.

Board members emphasized the need for NTAPAA's advice on the following issues:

- The number of pieces that would be valid at each level for the portfolio.
- The issue of student choice within portfolio topics.
- The best way to assess writing conventions.
- The ramifications on changing the weightedness of portfolio and on-demand writing.

TIMELINE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CONTENT STANDARDS

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated that the timeline now ends in April instead of February to allow more time for quality work.

David Tachau noted that when CTB McGraw Hill is mentioned in the Board's discussions, he will not participate because this company is a client in his law firm.

Hilma Prather indicated that the Board needs to see what the design for the content standards will look like and would like to have this inserted into the timeline.

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated there will be a general review of the standards first followed by review in the field with a final look by the Board for action.

***WRITTEN PROCESS FOR APPOINTMENT OF KHSAA BOARD OF CONTROL
AT-LARGE SEATS***

Jeff Mando moved approval of the Kentucky High School Athletic Association's At-Large Nomination Procedures submitted by staff to the Board and David Webb seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion. It was suggested to make the procedure clearer, that the third bullet under the portion of the procedure entitled "Procedure for KHSAA Board of Control At-Large Nomination and Recommendation" read as follows:

"A period of not more than 10 working days from the formal announcement will be provided for identifying candidates."

Mr. Mando agreed to amend his motion to include the change and Mr. Webb agreed to amend his second. The Board then voted and approved the procedure including the one amendment.

ADJOURNMENT

Jeff Mando moved to adjourn and Helen Mountjoy seconded the motion. The motion carried.